REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected.

In the amendment, Claims 1, 6, and 17 are amended and Claims 2-5, 10-16, and 18 – 20 are cancelled.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 6 – 9 and 17 are now at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Usami et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,911) in view of *Ota et al.* (JP 2002-163624), as cited in the previous Office Action.

Claim 1 recites an IC card comprising an IC module which comprises an IC chip mounted on an insulating substrate having an antenna coil, and a chip reinforcing plate provided on at least an IC mounted surface of said insulating substrate, and a core layer comprising a plurality of sheet materials having said IC module disposed therebetween, wherein, in said plurality of sheet materials, at least the sheet materials adjacent to said IC module have a through hole for containing therein said IC chip, formed in a region corresponding to an IC mounted portion of said IC module, wherein said plurality of sheet materials constituting said core layer comprise at least a pair of inner core sheets adjacent to said IC module, wherein a relationship $(B1 + C1) - 20\ \mu m \leq A \leq (B1 + C1) + 10\ \mu m$ is satisfied, where A (μm) represents the sum of heights of said through holes, B1 (μm) represents a projection height on an IC mounted surface of said IC module, and C1 (μm) represents a projection height on an IC non-mounted surface of said IC module, wherein relationships $B = B1 \pm 30\ \mu m$, and $C = C1 \pm 30\ \mu m$ are satisfied where B (μm) represents a height of said through hole on the side of the IC mounted surface of said IC module, and C (μm) represents a height of said through hole on the side of the IC non-mounted surface of said IC module.

None of the prior art teaches or discloses an IC card which comprises through holes satisfying the following relationship (B1 + C1) - 20 μm ≤A ≤(B1 + C1 + 10 μm, with B = B1 ± 30 μm, and C = C1 ± 30 μm.

The Examiner acknowledged Usami et al. teaches that the IC is 30 μm in thickness, and that Ota discloses in FIG. 1 that the height of the hole appears to be equal to that of the projections. However, both Usami et al. fails to teach or disclose the claimed relationship between A, B, C, B1, and C1.

Accordingly, for at least these cited reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of Claim 10 is now moot in view of its cancellation.

Claim 17 recites the same distinguishing feature as that of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 17 is also allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims1-5, 7-12 and 14-20

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ota et al.*

In view of the above discussion in regard to Claims 1 and 17, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 7 – 9, and 17 are allowable over Ota et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims1-5, 7-12 and 14-20

Claims 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ota et al.*, as discussed above, in view of *Saito et al.* (JP 11078324). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above discussion in regard to Claims 1 and 17, and cancellation of Claim 13, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 6 is allowable over Ota et al. in view of Saito et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 6 – 9 and 17 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2006 By: _____

David R. Metzger
Registration No.: 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000